

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

14 Defendants.

15
16 CASE NO. CV 9213
17 Subproceeding No. 05-03

18 ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS TO
19 STRIKE EXPERT WITNESSES

20 This matter is before the Court for consideration of motions by the opposing parties to strike each
21 others' expert witnesses. The Court finds merit in both motions, and for the reasons set forth below, now
22 grants both motions.

23 (1) Motion to Strike Barbara Lane, Ph.D. as an Expert Witness (Dkt. # 118).

24 The Suquamish Tribe ("Suquamish") has moved to strike Barbara Lane, Ph.D., as an expert
25 witness for the Upper Skagit Tribe ("Upper Skagit"). Dr. Lane is an anthropologist whose report on
26 historical tribal fishing grounds was a major item of evidence considered by Judge Boldt in *U.S. v.*
27 *Washington*, 384 F. Supp. 312 (W.D.Wash. 1974) ("Washington I"). The Upper Skagit has identified
28 her as an expert witness in this subproceeding, stating that she is "uniquely qualified to express an opinion
about Judge Boldt's intent in connection with his use of the phrase 'the marine waters of Puget Sound'"

ORDER - 1

1 in the context of the this case. Upper Skagit's Opposition, p. 2. However, this Court has already ruled,
2 in accordance with *Muckleshoot Tribe v. Lummi Indian Tribe*, 141 F. Ed 1355 (9th Cir. 1998)
3 ("Muckleshoot I"), that Dr. Lane may not offer latter-day testimony regarding the evidence that was
4 before Judge Boldt when he rendered his decision in 1974. Dkt. # 43. Although Dr. Lane's assistance
5 was of enormous value to the Court, the record now speaks for itself, and Dr. Lane may not offer her
6 opinion as to what she believes Judge Boldt intended.

7 The Suquamish motion to strike the expert testimony of Dr. Barbara Lane is accordingly
8 GRANTED.

9 (2) Motion to Strike Roger Shuy, Ph.D., as an Expert Witness (Dkt. # 122).

10 The Swinomish Indian Tribal Community ("Swinomish"), joined by the Upper Skagit, have
11 moved to strike Roger Shuy, Ph.D., as an expert witness for the Suquamish. Dr. Shuy is a professor of
12 linguistics (emeritus), who proposes to apply the linguistic tools of semantics, discourse analysis,
13 lexicography, and syntax to assist the Court in determining that Judge Boldt's use of the term "Puget
14 Sound" was not ambiguous. The Suquamish argue that this testimony meets all the requirements of
15 Fed.R.Evid. 702 and *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993). In response,
16 the Swinomish and Upper Skagit assert that regardless of reliability, this testimony is beyond the scope of
17 this Court's order relating to testimony beyond the record.

18 This Court, citing to *Muckleshoot I*, earlier defined the scope of the relevant evidence in this
19 proceeding. At the first step, the determination as to whether Judge Boldt's language was ambiguous,
20 the relevant evidence is that "which indicates the contemporary understanding of the extent of 'the marine
21 waters of Puget Sound. . .' which will 'shed light on the understanding that Judge Boldt had of the
22 geography at the time.' " Dkt. # 71, p. 4; quoting *Muckleshoot I*, 141 F. 3d at 1360; and *Muckleshoot*
23 *Indian Tribe v. Lummi Indian Nation*, 234 F. 3d 1099, 1100 (9th Cir. 2000) ("Muckleshoot II").
24 Should the evidence show that the areas disputed here are within the geographic reach of Puget Sound as
25 that term was commonly understood in 1974, the requesting parties must then produce evidence that
26 Judge Boldt intended some other meaning when he wrote Finding of Fact 5. *Id.* "The evidence that is
27 relevant to Judge Boldt's intent comprises 'the entire record before the issuing court and the findings of

1 fact [which] may be referenced in determining what was decided.' " *Id.*, quoting *Muckleshoot I*, 141 F.
2 3d at 1359.

3 Nowhere was it contemplated that linguistic analysis would be relevant to the determination of
4 ambiguity or intent in Judge Boldt's language. The motion of the Swinomish and Upper Skagit to strike
5 the expert testimony of Dr. Roger Shuy is accordingly GRANTED.

6
7 Dated this 10 day of October, 2006.

8
9
10 
11 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28